Remarks

In response to the office action of October 4, 2007, Applicant submits this paper. Claims 1-2 and 9-16 remain pending. Claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 14, and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been entered.

Amendments of Claims

Each of claims 1, 9, and 12 has been amended to clarify its preamble. Claims 1, 9, 12, 14, and 15 have been amended to clarify their language. No new matter has been entered.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 9-11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claim 9 has been amended to overcome to the rejection. No new matter has been entered.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2 stand rejected over Minard under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Minard. Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

> "   wherein said form content and said HTML content are …
> displayed in a Java applet execution in a browser in said common
> window..."

Minard fails to disclose this recitation. Minard rather describes a Java and HTML editing system that provides different views (or contexts) of a single page under development. In particular, the views include a navigation pane 410, a content pane 450, and a structure pane 430. See column 8, lines 41-51. There is no disclosure of the form content and HTML content displayed in the Java execution applet. While Java code and its resultant viewable form may be viewed in an application browser in Minard, there is no disclosure of HTML and form content being combined and displayed in the execution of the Java code. While the HTML content and Java executions may be displayed side-by-side, there is no disclosure in Minard of the HTML content being displayed inside the recited Java applet execution.

Further, claim 1 now recites:

> "said Java applet execution providing browsing capabilities between different pages of HTML content displayed in said Java applet execution."

Minard fails to disclose any browsing capabilities of different pages of HTML content where the HTML content is displayed in the Java applet execution. Rather, the displayed information in Minard relates to separate files and how those files would appear to a user. Again here, each page of Minard (possibly including Java content) is displayed in the browser, not different pages of HTML content displayed in the Java execution that is displayed in the browser. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Minard.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite:

> "said graphical user interface includes tabs permitting access to said form content having said different pages of HTML content."

In contrast, Minard fails to disclose the tabs relating to different pages of HTML content. Rather, the tabs only provide different contexts in which to view a singular page of HTML content. See Minard's Abstract; column 8, lines 1-62; column 9, line 63, through column 10, line 15; and column 10, lines 16-59. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable over Minard.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9-11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Minard in view of Cason. Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claim 9 recites:

> " wherein said HTML content is rendered and controlled by said Java applet and rendered inside a Java execution in said at least one window…"

The examiner notes that Minard fails to teach or suggest this recitation. The examiner then relies on Cason to teach this recitation. However, the section relied upon by the examiner fails to teach or suggest what the examiner is asserting. Column 21, lines 35-51, is reproduced below:

"6. Relational DB Agents

In accordance with a preferred embodiment of the invention, in a Notes/DB2 hybrid environment, a Notes agent reads data from a DB2 table, and then dynamically populates that data to an HTML page. In this manner, an the existing infrastructure (including Notes, Domino Go, and DB2) is used to combine HTML and Java script web presentation with DB2 data.

Referring to FIG. 20, Notes agents 440 are used as intermediaries. ***Each such agent 440 reads DB2 tables 390, collects data using SQL select statements, and builds web page 442 dynamically, writing out the Java script and HTML to present the page on a Web browser, such as Web browser 100.*** The results of the DB2 searches also helps to determine which HTML needs to be written, something which standard HTML cannot handle. Thus, conditional logic may be used." (Emphasis added.)

Applicant refers the Examiner to the highlighted text above. In particular, Cason describes building a webpage by combining JavaScript and HTML. However, the combination is displayed in web browser 100. Claim 9 recites "said HTML content … rendered inside a Java execution in said at least one window…" There is no teaching or suggestion in Cason that HTML content is rendered *inside* a Java execution. In fact, this section relied upon by the Examiner at most teaches placing HTML content and JavaScript content *side by side* on the same page. Further, the examiner has failed to address this failing of Cason. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over the combination of Minard and Cason.

Dependent claims 10-11 and 16 are allowable at least for this reason.

Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Minard in view of Cason and in further review of Maddalozzo. Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claim 12 recites:

"   wherein said HTML content is rendered and controlled by

said Java applet and rendered inside said Java execution…"

Similar to the rejection of claim 9, the Examiner relies on Cason to suggest this recitation. As with respect to Applicant's response to the rejection of claim 9, Applicant again

7

asserts that Cason fails to teach or suggest this recitation. Further, Maddalozzo fails to cure this failing of Minard and Cason. Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable over the combination.

Dependent claims 13-15 are allowable at least as being dependent on allowable claim 12.

All rejections have been addressed. If the Examiner has any questions, she is invited to contact the undersigned to further the prosecution of the invention.

Please charge any fee associated with the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: /Christopher R. Glembocki/
Christopher R. Glembocki
Reg. No. 38,800

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

Dated: January 4, 2008